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8. *A person is innocent until proven guilty.*

When you commit a crime, does anyone else have to inform you of the fact that you did so in order for you to realize that you did? Of course not, you are very well aware of your guilt and require solely yourself for this. In a court of law, all whom enter are rightfully considered innocent until proven guilty. Otherwise, imagine how many falsely accused people would be strapped in jail at this very moment? Those whom are truly innocent shall forever remain innocent, whilst not necessarily in the eyes of the court; likewise goes for those whom are guilty. A court is not necessary to prove your guilt; for a criminal may easily be convicted as being innocent whilst being culpable of the crime he was tried for and likely all the more. For instance, in *The Crucible*, an infamous play by Arthur Miller, the girls whom were testifying against the alleged witches were obviously falsely providing evidence in support of the fact that the supposed criminals were practicing witchcraft. The girls knew that what they were committing was a felony, and so did few others, yet the court refused to accept their innocence and rather supported them as they testified against all whom dared to question the validity of their demonstrations. Did the fact that the court viewed them as innocent make them any less guilty of their crime? Despite the fact that their guilt was not proven, they most definitely were not innocent, for once you commit an action it is done, no matter who may corroborate with the fact that you did or did not. The idea of one’s innocence of an action may solely apply in terms theoretical affairs. For, in reality, you simply cannot undo what has already been done, nor may you have done something you never did. As opposed to both the court and reality, the judging that took place during the Salem Witch Trials automatically assumed you to be guilty once accused, therefore forcing the supposed criminal into attempting to prove themselves innocent. This is far more open to the potential of corruption in comparison to the modern means by which the court accuses its criminals of guilt. In reality, no one, other than yourself, has the capacity to decide upon your guilt without indisputable evidence of it. What the girls staged throughout the trials was none other than an act of theater, and the views of the judges confirmed this in bias based on the false pretense of the purity of naïve children. So, as we can see, it all depends on the point of view by which you decide to approach this topic. In a theoretical situation, one’s guilt is indefinite and therefore subject to change. This view is largely dependent upon the opinions of others, and what one may do in order to sway them in either direction. Meanwhile, when brought into the pretense of reality, one’s unalterable guilt or innocence is definite, not in the minds of those whom seek to be convinced, but in that of those whom beheld the act and whom committed it.